

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 and 13-24 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 16, 20-23 are amended. Claim 24 is added. Support for the amendments and additions can be found in the originally filed specification at Figure 1 and related discussion at paragraphs 0011, 0016, and 0017. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 1-11 and 13-23 stand objected to. These objections are respectfully traversed.

The Examiner objects to “for defining at least one tag” and “thereby identifying” in claim 1. The Examiner objects to “thereby providing” in claim 16. The Examiner objects to “thereby differentiating” in claim 20. The Examiner objects to “adapted to accomplish” in claims 21-23. The Examiner objects to “said speech inputs is located” in claim 23. Applicants have removed the objectionable language.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objections.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for reciting, “or combinations thereof.” This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have removed the indefinite language.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-11 and 13-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 16 to specify that the tags are defined in computer readable memory.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 6- 8, 14, 16, and 20-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Spielberg (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2002/0129057) in view of Caspi (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2004/0250201). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner relies on Spielberg to teach annotating a pre-authored screenplay or book during a review process by speaking into an input associated with a device for reviewing the pre-authored screenplay, with or without any preexisting annotations provided by other reviewers. The Examiner also relies on Spielberg to teach that the preexisting annotations, if any, are filterable by reviewer/source. However, Spielberg does not teach, suggest, or motivate that the media is a media stream captured by camera units simultaneously operated by different cameramen at a shooting scene, that the tags are supplied by different cameramen via speech inputs of the camera units, or that the tags are filtered by cameraman.

The Examiner relies on Caspi to teach an annotation system in which different computer clients have different speech inputs, with tags supplied by those inputs being labeled in order to indicate which client/user supplied which tag. However, Spielberg

and Caspi do not teach, suggest, or motivate that the media is a media stream captured by camera units simultaneously operated by different cameramen at a shooting scene, that the tags are supplied by different cameramen via speech inputs of the camera units, or that the tags are filtered by cameraman.

Applicant's claimed invention is generally directed toward a collaborative media indexing system and method. In particular, Applicants' claimed invention is directed toward a collaborative tag handling system in which a media stream captured by camera units simultaneously operated by different cameramen at a shooting scene is tagged by tags that are supplied by different cameramen via speech inputs of the camera units, with the tags being filtered by cameraman. For example, independent claim 1, especially as amended, recites, "a first camera unit capturing the media and having a first speech input supplying speech of a first cameraman operating the first camera unit for defining a first tag in computer readable memory; a second camera unit capturing the media and having a second speech input supplying speech of a second cameraman operating the second camera unit for defining a second tag in computer readable memory; a tagging system for assigning each said first tag and said second tag to the media; and a collaborative tag handling system for dispatching each said at least one tag to a plurality of individuals for review based on cameraman, wherein each said first tag and said second tag includes a label identifying which of said first cameraman and said second cameraman provided the tag, and said first camera unit and said second camera unit are operated simultaneously to capture a shooting scene." Independent claim 16, especially as amended, recites similar subject matter. Therefore, Spielberg and Caspi do not teach, suggest, or motivate all of the limitations of

independent claims 1 and 16, especially as amended. These differences are significant.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of independent claims 1 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), along with rejection of all claims dependent therefrom.

Claims 3-5, 11, 15, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spielberg (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2002/0129057) in view of Caspi (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2004/0250201) and Bennett et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,884,256). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For discussion of the teachings of Spielberg and Caspi, Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to remarks detailed above with respect to rejection of independent claims 1 and 16.

Bennet et al. do not teach all of the elements recited in independent claims 1 and 16, nor does the Examiner rely on Bennet et al. in this capacity. These differences are significant.

Accordingly, Applicant's respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 3-6, 11, 14-15, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on their dependence from allowable base claims.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spielberg (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2002/0129057) in view of Caspi (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2004/0250201) and Ebert (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0144985). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For discussion of the teachings of Spielberg and Caspi, Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to remarks detailed above with respect to rejection of independent claim 1.

Ebert does not teach all of the elements recited in independent claim 1, nor does the Examiner rely on Ebert in this capacity. These differences are significant.

Accordingly, Applicant's respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on its dependence from an allowable base claim.

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spielberg (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2002/0129057) in view of Caspi (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2004/0250201) and Jain et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,463,444). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For discussion of the teachings of Spielberg and Caspi, Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to remarks detailed above with respect to rejection of independent claim 1.

Jain et al. do not teach all of the elements recited in independent claim 1, nor does the Examiner rely on Jain et al. in this capacity. These differences are significant.

Moreover, Applicants note that claim 10 is dependent from claim 9, and that Jain et al. does not teach generating an attribute using a sensor. Therefore, the rejection of claim 10 is improperly based on Spielberg, Caspi, and Jain et al. alone, especially where the Examiner relies upon Ebert teach elements of claim 9.

Accordingly, Applicant's respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on its dependence from an allowable base claim.

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spielberg (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2002/0129057) in view of Caspi (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2004/0250201) and Srivastava et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,549,922). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For discussion of the teachings of Spielberg and Caspi, Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to remarks detailed above with respect to rejection of independent claim 1.

Srivastava et al. do not teach all of the elements recited in independent claim 1, nor does the Examiner rely on Srivastava et al. in this capacity. These differences are significant.

Accordingly, Applicant's respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on its dependence from an allowable base claim.

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spielberg (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2002/0129057) in view of Caspi (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2004/0250201) and Lui et al. (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2003/0105589). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For discussion of Spielberg and Caspi, Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to remarks detailed above with respect to rejection of independent claim 16.

Lui et al. do not teach all of the elements recited in independent claim 16, nor does the Examiner rely on Liu et al. in this capacity. These differences are significant.

Accordingly, Applicant's respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on its dependence from an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Feb 19, 2007

By: Gregory A. Stobbs
Gregory A. Stobbs
Reg. No. 28,764

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

[GAS/JSB/kp]